

FILED

MAY 17 2010

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia**

TAURICE M. CRISP,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALVIN WALKER,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action No.

10 0810

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even *pro se* litigants, however, must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff, who currently is incarcerated at a state correctional institution in North Carolina, alleges that he has been “denied everything since 1995,” including jail credit, sex, phone calls, mail, food, freedom, and medical treatment, among other privileges. Compl. at 5 (page number designated by the court). Although the pleading alludes to tort claims and claims under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), plaintiff does not articulate what those claims are. Nor does plaintiff expressly state the relief he demands. See Compl. at 5.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff’s complaint and concludes that it neither contains a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court’s jurisdiction depends nor a claim that plaintiff is entitled to the relief he seeks. For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for its failure to comply with Rule 8(a). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.



United States District Judge

Date: 8/4/10